

## CITY OF REDONDO BEACH

## INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY NO. 00-00

1.	Project Title:		
2.	Lead Agency Name and Address:	City of Redondo Beach 415 Diamond Street Redondo Beach, CA 90277	
3.	Contact person and phone number:		
4.	Project Location:	Redondo Beach, California	
5.	Project Sponsor's Name and Address:		
6.	General Plan Designation:		
7.	Zoning:		
8.	<b>Description of Project:</b> (Describe the walter phases of the project, and any sectiffs implementation.)		
	The project consists of	on a lot containing	

10.	Other agencies whose participation agreemen	e approval is required: (e.g., permits, t.)	financing approval, or			
The en	rs Potentially Affected: vironmental factors checked	tission permits needed if located in Coastal 2 and below would be potentially affected by the ignificant Impact" as indicated by the checkle	is project, involving at least			
□Lan	d Use and Planning	☐ Transportation/Circulation	☐ Public Services			
□ Pop	oulation and Housing		Biological Resources   ☐ Utilities ε			
Service	e Systems					
☐ Geo	ological Problems		Energy and Mineral Resources			
Aesthe	tics					
□ Wa	ter		Hazards ☐ Cultural Resources			
□Air	Quality		Noise   Recreation			
□ Ma	ndatory Findings of Signifi	cance				
Deterr	nination.					
On the	basis of this initial evaluation	on:				
		project <b>COULD NOT</b> have a significant efficient RATION will be prepared.	ect on the environment, and			
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A <b>NEGATIVE DECLARATION</b> will be prepared.					
		project <b>MAY</b> have a significant effect on the <b>MPACT REPORT</b> is required.	environment, and an			
	least one effect 1) has be legal standards, and 2) has	project <b>MAY</b> have a significant effect(s) en adequately analyzed in an earlier documes been addressed by mitigation measures be sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant effect(s) en adequately effect is a "potentially significant effect(s) en adequately en en adequately en en adequately en en en adequately en	nent pursuant to applicable based on the earlier analysis			

I.E.S. 00-00

2

Print	ted Name	For
		City of Redondo Beach
Signa	ature	Date
	there <b>WILL NOT</b> be a significant effect in the have been analyzed adequately in an earlier been avoided or mitigated pursuant to the measures that are imposed upon the propose	
	significant unless mitigated." An <b>ENVIRON</b> it must analyze only the effects that remain to	MENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but be addressed.
	significant unless mitigated " An ENVIRON	MENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required by

## **Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:**

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section 17 at the end of the checklist.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

Issi	ues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	U	No Impact
<b>1.</b> a)	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the proposal:  Conflict with general plan designation or zoning? (Source #'s: 1, 2, 3, 5)				

b)	Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project? (1)		
c)	Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity? $(1, 2, 3, 5)$		

Potentially Significant

Issi	ues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact	
		<b>_</b>				
d)	Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? (3)					
e)	Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (1, 3)					
<u>2.</u>	POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:					
a)	Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? $(1, 3, 4)$					
b)	Induce substantial growth in an area either directly					
	or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)? (1, 3, 4)					
c)	Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? (1)					
3.	GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:					
a)	Fault rupture? (1, 3, 4)					
b)	Seismic ground shaking? (1, 3, 4)					
c)	Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction? (1, 3, 4)					
d)	Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard? (1, 3, 4)					
e)	Landslides or mudflows? (1, 3, 4)					
f)	Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? (1, 3, 4)					
g)	Subsidence of the land? (1, 3, 4)					
h)	Expansive soils? (1, 3, 4)					
i)	Unique geologic or physical features? (1, 3, 4)					
4.	WATER. Would the proposal result in:					

6

a)	Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? (1)				
b)	Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding? (1, 3, 9)				
<u>Issu</u>	ues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant I Impact	No <u>Impact</u>
c)	Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)? (1)				
d)	Changes in the amount of surface water in a water body? (1)				
e)	Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements? (1)				
f)	Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations, or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability? (1, 3, 4)				
g)	Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (1, 3, 4)				
h)	Impacts to groundwater quality? (1)				
i)	Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies? (1)				
j)	Stormwater system discharges from areas for materials storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery or loading docks or other work areas? (1, 10)				
k)	A significantly environmentally harmful increase in the flow rate or volume of stormwater runoff? (1, 10)				
1)	A significantly environmentally harmful increase in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas? (1)				
m)	Stormwater discharges that would significantly impair the beneficial uses of receiving waters or areas that provide water quality benefits (e.g. riparian corridors, wetlands, etc.)? (1)				

n)	Harm to the biological integrity of drainage systems and water bodies? (1)				
o)	Proposed construction with a potential impact on stormwater runoff? (1)				
p)	Proposed post-construction activity that would have a potential impact on stormwater runoff? (1)				
<u>Iss</u>	ues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant l Impact	No Impact
<u>5.</u>	AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:				
a)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? (1, 3, 4, 14)				
b)	Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? (1)				
c)	Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate? (1)				
d)	Create objectionable odors? (1)				
<u>6.</u>	TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:				
a)	Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion? (1, 3, 4, 6)				
b)	Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (1)				
c)	Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?  (1)   \[ \bigcup_{} \]				
d)	Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (1, 5)				
e)	Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? (1)				
f)	Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (1, 3)				

8

g)	Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts? (1)		Ш		
<u>7.                                    </u>	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in impacts to:				
a)	Endangered, threatened, or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)? (1, 3, 4)				
b)	Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)? (1, 3, 4)				
c)	Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)? (1, 3, 4)				
d)	Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian, and vernal pool)? (1, 3, 4)				
e)	Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors? (1, 3, 4)		Potentially		
Issi	ues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant	No Impact
<u>8. ]</u>	ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:				
a) b)	Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? (1, 3) Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? (1)				
c)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State? (1, 3)				
<u>9.</u>	HAZARDS. Would the proposal involve:				
a)	A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation)? (1)				
b)	Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (1)				
c)	The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard? (1)				
d)					
	Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (1)				

e)	Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees? (1, 2)				
<u>10.</u>	NOISE. Would the proposal result in:				
a)	Increases in existing noise levels? (1, 3, 4)				
b)	Exposure of people to severe noise levels? (1, 12)				
<u>11.</u>	PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:				
a)	Fire protection? (1, 3, 4)				
b)	Police protection? (1, 3, 4)				
c)	Schools? (1, 3, 4)				
d)	Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (1, 3, 4)				
e)	Other governmental services? (1, 3, 4)		☐ Potentially		
			Significant		
Issu	ues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:	Significant	Mitigation	Significant	
	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or	Significant	Mitigation	Significant	
<u>12.</u>	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:	Significant	Mitigation	Significant	
12. a)	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:  Power or natural gas? (1, 3, 4)	Significant	Mitigation	Significant	
a) b)	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:  Power or natural gas? (1, 3, 4)  Communications systems? (1, 3, 4)  Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?	Significant	Mitigation	Significant	
a) b) c)	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:  Power or natural gas? (1, 3, 4)  Communications systems? (1, 3, 4)  Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities? (1, 3, 4)	Significant	Mitigation	Significant	
a) b) c) d)	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:  Power or natural gas? (1, 3, 4)  Communications systems? (1, 3, 4)  Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities? (1, 3, 4)  Sewer or septic tanks? (1, 3, 4, 13)	Significant	Mitigation	Significant	
a) b) c) d)	UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:  Power or natural gas? (1, 3, 4)  Communications systems? (1, 3, 4)  Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities? (1, 3, 4)  Sewer or septic tanks? (1, 3, 4, 13)  Storm water drainage? (1, 3, 4)	Significant	Mitigation	Significant	

	(1, 3)		Ш		
b)	Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect? (1)				
c)	Create light or glare? (1, 5)				
<u>14.</u>	CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:				
a)	Disturb paleontological resources? (1, 3, 4, 8)				
b)	Disturb archaeological resources? (1, 3, 4, 8)				
c)	Affect historical resources? (1, 3, 4, 7)				
d)	Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (1)				
e)	Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (1)				
<u>15.</u>	RECREATION. Would the proposal:				
a)	Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities? (1, 3, 4)				
			_	_	
b)	Affect existing recreational opportunities? (1, 3, 4)				
	Affect existing recreational opportunities? (1, 3, 4)  ues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporate	Less Than Significant	No Impact
<u>Iss</u> ı		Significant	Significant Unless Mitigation	Less Than Significant	
<u>Iss</u> ı	ues (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant	Significant Unless Mitigation	Less Than Significant	
<u>Issu</u> <u>16.</u>	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of	Significant	Significant Unless Mitigation	Less Than Significant	

d)	the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)  Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		

## 17. EARLIER ANALYSES.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets:

- a) Earlier analyses used. Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
- b) Impacts adequately addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
- c) Mitigation measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

LIST OF SOURCES/ATTACHMENTS (These reports are available at the City of Redondo Beach Planning Department, Door E, 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California 90277):

- 1) Discussion of Environmental Evaluation
- 2) General Plan Map of Redondo Beach
- 3) Redondo Beach General Plan, 1992
- 4) General Plan EIR, 1992
- 5) Redondo Beach Zoning Ordinance
- 6) Institute of Traffic Engineer's Trip Generation Manual
- 7) Historic Resources Surveys, 1986, 1996
- 8) Archeological Research and Site Identification for Resources Reported to be Located within the City of Redondo Beach, 1996
- 9) Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Map
- 10) C of A refers to a condition of approval of the resolution. This does not necessarily signify that a significant environmental impact has been identified but rather may be a way to reduce even insignificant impacts or may be a standard condition of approval.
- 11) Harbor/Civic Center Specific Plan, 1992
- 12) Municipal Code Title 2, Chapter 24 (Noise Ordinance)
- 13) Wastewater System Master Plan and Wastewater Revenue Rate Analysis (WSMP), prepared in January, 1994 by Kennedy/Jenks Consultants
- 14) South Coast Air Quality Management District CEQA Air Quality Handbook, April 1993